



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,860	05/30/2001	Farah Moaven	WELL0016	8988

22862 7590 05/18/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/870,860	Applicant(s) MOAVEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Jenise E. Jackson	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Taghi T. Arani
Primary Examiner
Aug 2006
Doyle O'Neil

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-10, 12-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. More specifically, the limitations, **“responsive to the resource owner granting approval, assigning the approved job profile to the resource profile such that any user at any point in time assigned to the approved job profile by the manager automatically gains approval and access to the at least one resource”**. The Examiner asserts, that the “any point in time” limitation is not disclosed in the specification. On page 9, there is no disclosure of a specific time in which the user assigned to a job profile gains access. There is a disclosure of automatic access once the job profile to the resource profile is approved, granting access rights to users that have that specific job profile; however, there is no disclosure of a specific time.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-10, 12-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are rejected under new matter, with regards to the

Art Unit: 2131

limitation of “**at any point in time**”. Since it is not disclosed in the specification, the Examiner will not search for this feature. Thus, any arguments on this limitation are moot, because this is new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-10, 12-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al(6,161,139) in view of Hudson et al(6,055,637).

7. As per claims 1, 10, 32, Win et al. discloses a method of requesting approval for accessing a resource in a system of resources (see col. 3, lines 66-67, col. 4, lines 16-18, col. 5, lines 45-47), performing an approval process(see col. 5, lines 45-55), creating a resource profile including at least one resource(see col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 27-30), wherein the at least one resource has an owner(see col. 5, lines 34-35, col. 16, lines 59-67); a manager (i.e. admin) creating a job profile including at least one object construction, the object construction representing a job function(see col. 4, lines 66, col. 5, lines 1-44, see col. 12, lines 45-50, 65-67, col. 13, lines 9-15, 59-60); assigning the job profile to the resource profile(see col. 5, lines 1-33), such that any user subsequently assigned to the job profile by the manager automatically gains approval and access to the at least one resource included in the resource profile(see col. 4, line 66, col. 5, lines 1-45), assigning a least one user to the approved job profile(see col. 4, line 67,

Art Unit: 2131

col. 5, lines 1-35), a manager only once assigning a job profile to resource profile(see col. 14, lines 9-25). Win is silent on requesting of the resource owner approval for access by the job profile to the at least one resource, and responsive to the resource owner granting approval.

Hudson et al. discloses requesting of the resource owner approval for access by the job profile to the at least one resource, and responsive to the resource owner granting approval(see col. 4, lines 33-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include requesting of the resource owner approval for access by the job profile to the at least one resource, and responsive to the resource owner granting approval of Hudson with Win et al., the motivation is that in order to grant access to resources, one must request access to the resource from the resource owner(see col. 4, lines 23-50 of Hudson).

8. As per claim 2, Win et al. discloses wherein the requesting step automatically originates from the assigning step(see col. 5, lines 29-32).

9. As per claim 3, Win et al. discloses wherein the resource profile includes at least one computing device(see col. 4, lines 46-66).

10. As per claim 4, Win et al. discloses wherein the resource profile includes at least one software module(i.e. applet)(see col. 4, lines 65-66).

11. As per claim 5, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one job(see col. 5, lines 1-11).

12. As per claim 6, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one role(see col. 5, lines 12-41).

13. As per claim 7, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one project(see col. 5, lines 1-27).

Art Unit: 2131

14. As per claim 8, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one workgroup(see col. 5, lines 1-27).
15. As per claim 9, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one responsibility (see col. 5, lines 1-27).
16. As per claim 12, Win et al. discloses including granting an account to the user for accessing the approved resource(see col. 9, lines 17-45).
17. As per claim 13, Win et al. discloses wherein the account is automatically provided following the assigning the user to the approved job profile(see col. 5, lines 22-47).
18. As per claim 14, Win et al. discloses wherein the resource profile includes at least one computing device(see col. 4, lines 46-66).
19. As per claim 15, Win et al. discloses wherein the resource profile includes at least one application software(i.e. applet)(see col. 4, lines 65-66).
20. As per claim 16, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one job(see col. 5, lines 1-11).
21. As per claim 17, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one role(see col. 5, lines 1-11).
22. As per claim 18, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one project(see col. 5, lines 1-27).
23. As per claim 19, Win et al. discloses wherein the job profile includes at least one workgroup(see col. 5, lines 1-27).
24. As per claim 20, same motivation as above. Win et al. discloses receiving a request for a job profile to access the resource profile(see col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 27-30); evaluating

Art Unit: 2131

the request (see col. 5, lines 35-44, col. 13, lines 7-23); and deciding to grant access approval such that if access approval is granted, future accesses of the resource profile by members of the job profile that do not need to request approval(see col. 5, lines 45-55). Win does not disclose a request or approval to a resource owner. Hudson discloses a request to a resource owner, and approval(see col. 4, lines 33-45).

25. As per claim 21, Win et al. discloses wherein the deciding step includes restricting the resource profile to be accessed by a certain job profile(see col. 5, lines 1-29).

26. As per claim 22, same motivation as above. Win et al. discloses a system for accessing computing resources(see col. 3, lines 66-67, col. 4, lines 16-18, col. 5, lines 45-47), at least one user terminal(see col. 4, lines 46-49); at least one database including at least one application software(see col. 4, lines 58-67); at least one computing device(see col. 4, lines 11-45); means for creating a resource profile including the at least one database and the at least one application software, wherein the resource profile has at least one owner(see col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-11); means for creating a job profile managed by a manager and related to at least one user; means for assigning the resource profile to the job profile(see col. 5, lines 1-33); means for approving once the job profile access to the resource profile by at least one resource owner(see col. 5, lines 35-44, col. 13, lines 7-23); and means for providing any member assigned to the job profile automatically gains access to at least one resource included in the resource profile(see col. 5, lines 1-55). Win does not disclose requesting or approval of the resource by the resource owner. Hudson discloses resource owner, and the requesting and approval of the resource by the resource owner(see col. 4, lines 33-45).

Art Unit: 2131

27. As per claim 23, Win et al. discloses implemented on a network environment(see col. 4, lines 51-57).

28. As per claim 24, Win et al. discloses wherein the network environment further including Internet(see col. 4, lines 51-57).

29. As per claim 25, Win et al. discloses wherein at least one of the resource profile(see col. 5, lines 1-33), the computing device(see col. 4, lines 46-66), and the software module is owned by various resource owners(see col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-10).

30. As per claim 26, Win et al. discloses determining whether a plurality of resources may be grouped together in a resource profile; and grouping the plurality of resources in the resource profile if such grouping is allowed, such that if access approval is granted once to an authorized job profile for the resource profile, future accesses by the authorized job profile of the resource profile do not need access approval(see col. 5, lines 1-47).

31. As per claim 27, Win et al. discloses wherein the determining step further includes checking against an exclusion rule(see col. 5, lines 1-47).

32. As per claim 28, Win et al. discloses indicating that the resource profile may not be built if the grouping is not allowed under the exclusion rule(see col. 5, lines 1-47).

33. As per claim 29, same motivation above. Win et al. discloses a method for assigning a job profile to a resource profile(see col. 5, lines 1-33); determining whether a job profile may be assigned to a resource profile; and one time assigning the job profile to the resource profile if such assignment is requested by a manager of the job profile and allowed, such that a user assigned to the job profile gains automatic approval for accessing the resource profile(see col. 5,

Art Unit: 2131

lines 1-55). Win does not disclose requesting of the resource by the resource owner. Hudson discloses requesting and approval of the resource by the resource owner(see col. 4, lines 33-45).

34. As per claim 30, Win et al. discloses wherein the determining step further includes checking against an exclusion rule(see col. 5, lines 1-47).

35. As per claim 31, Win et al. discloses indicating that the job profile may not be assigned to the resource profile if the assignment is not allowed under the exclusion rule(see col. 5, lines 1-47).

Response to Amendment

36. The Applicant states that there is no separation of a prior approval process from the access process. The Examiner does not see claimed, a **“separation of a prior approval process from the access process”**. The Examiner asserts that this point is moot, because this is not claimed by the Applicant.

37. The Applicant states that in Win nor Hudson does not disclose a manager negotiating for a resource owner granting approval to the resources that are included in a profile that could be at any time prior to actually requesting access. The Examiner asserts that **Win nor Hudson does not disclose a manager negotiating for a resource owner granting approval to the resources that are included in a profile that could be at any time prior to actually requesting access** is not disclosed in the specification. On page 9, of the specification, what is disclosed is, **“a manager may negotiate with one or more resource owners to get approval for accessing the resources within a resource profile, users that are associated with job profiles that are assigned to the resource profile are automatically given all the access rights that are**

specified in the resource profile. There is not disclosed a resource owner granting approval to the resources that are included in a profile that could be at any time prior to actually requesting access. Thus, this point is moot.

38. The Applicant states that Win nor Hudson discloses a separation of concerns, resource owners manage resources, and managers manage their users. Once again, the claims do not disclose this separation. An example, of which is claim 1, which claims, **“a manager creating a job profile”**. Win discloses that the system enables administrators to implement access rules by defining roles(i.e. job) that users play when working for an organization or doing business with an enterprise(see col. 4, line 67, col. 5, lines 1-2). Win discloses that a role may reflect a relationship of a user to the organization(see col. 5, lines 1-11). The system, and administrators can assign roles to user or delete roles from a user(see col. 5, lines 35-44). Thus, Win discloses the claim limitation, of a **“manager creating a job profile”**.

39. Also, an example of claim 1, claims, **“responsive to the resource owner granting approval, assigning the approved job profile to the resource profile”**. Hudson discloses that the central security administrator directs and forwards requests for accessing resource to the owner of the requested resource to seek approval(see col. 4, lines 43-45). Thus, the administrator has to seek approval of the resource owner first in order to access the resource. Hudson also discloses that the resource owner maintains a directory, that list roles and their owners(see col. 4, lines 23-45).

Art Unit: 2131

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



May 12, 2006

Taghi T. Arani
primary Examiner
AU 2131
T. T. Arani
5/14/06